

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee

IPM Workgroup Meeting Notes

Arlington, VA May 13, 2015

Roll Call

See Appendix A – IPM Workgroup Meeting Participants

Welcome

Bob McNally and Frank Ellis

School IPM Update

Recognition Program

Jennifer Lemon discussed in detail the tiers of the School IPM recognition program as they progress from Great Start, Leadership, Excellence, Sustained, and Connector. The program is similar to the IAQ Tools for Schools program which used in the past.

Lee Tanner presented the process for collecting survey information and authorization, as every application must go through the OMB process and could take up to 24 months. During the FR notices, stakeholders will have the opportunity to respond to comments. The awards program should be operational around 12 months from now.

- Thomas Cook mentioned that school districts have been contacted for the ICR burden estimate. The schools will tell us via forms the amount of time the process takes, and the time will then be evaluated for benefit cost analysis.

One way to avoid possible delays that was discussed is through the help of higher level officials within the EPA.

- Marc Lane suggested the process could become more efficient if the high level administration were engaged.
- Bob McNally followed by saying that Jim Jones's office prioritizes all OCSPS submissions to OMB so there will be an opportunity to attempt to expedite.

There are resource constraints with verification of the applications, according to Frank Ellis. There is no way to do physical verification with it requiring so many site visits and resources. Following this, mention was made that Tools for Schools verification consisted of the regions being a part of the application review process but not conducting site visits.

- Marc Lane said that he understands the lack of resources for verification, but he does not want the School IPM Recognition Program to provide false confidence that schools think they are doing more than they are actually doing. He mentioned that although the Tools for Schools was successful, it was lacking in IPM. He further mentioned an idea of constructing a website designed for comments from parents and teachers.
- Janet Hurley said the EPA should work with the SLA's (State Lead Agencies) and Extension Services to get verification of the award winners.

- Bob McNally followed by saying it could be necessary to check in with the SLA's to see what they know about the program.
- Robyn Guilden suggested that third-party verification is needed and asked whether a parent's group could fill that role.
- Concern with the verification of IPM used within districts was also voiced by Dawn Gouge. She showed favor with the award system and its increments, but she is worried with the level of self-assessment in the applications. Because of the possibility of districts figuring out how to complete the application to get the award but not actually do IPM, she suggested finding in-state subject matter experts and include SLA's and the Extension Services. She noted that she doesn't like to see checklists but would prefer, at least for higher-level awards, activity reports and even require references / endorsements.
- With the ease to document activity these days via photograph, videos, and stories, Tom Delaney said this could be a solution for verifying district use of IPM.
- Tom Green asked if and to what degree the Recognition Program is related to PESP (Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program). He said the design of the program is good, but he expressed the need to include disclaimer language that any awards are based on what the applicant(s) reported to EPA. He also recommended conducting a desk audit on 5-10% of applicants.

Resource Investments

Frank Ellis presented the resource investments for the SIPM program, showing that there has been a total of \$4.6 million internal investments and \$1.9 million external investments since 2011.

- Bob McNally talked about staffing and mentioned there are a number of issues beyond our control.
- After Bob McNally asked for discussion on the topic, Tom Delaney asked what would be done with the resources if there was more money for the program.
 - Frank Ellis responded that the resources would support the wholesale approach toward national level impacts. Dawn Gouge and Janet Hurley's projects also lead to national training via the wholesale approach, as Bob McNally stated.
- With regards to the resource allocation, Marc Lame said there should be a strategy with clear objectives, and he added that there should exist more accountability with regard to how the regions are using their FTE.
- After reiterating Marc Lame's comment about the strategy, Dawn Gouge mentioned the School IPM 2020 Strategic Plan which will soon be submitted to USDA and will be available on the web. Furthermore, she mentioned that she would like for the resources to be shifted, and Bob McNally replied that the resources cannot be shifted between Regions or between FTE and grants and the wholesale approach will continue.

Work is being done to update the strategic plan and strategic vision, according to Frank Ellis. He proceeded to introduce Cathy Eiden, who will be working with BPPD to promote national partnerships for School IPM at the wholesale levels. Following that, Bob McNally talked about CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) point people and the NPMA (National Pest Management Association) partnerships already in existence.

- The way the Agency uses resources should be reevaluated according to Marc Lame, as he said we need more influencers and better "bang for the buck." He further suggested that stakeholders and partners go directly to the Regional Administrators and ask for more resources to be directed toward School IPM and more money to State Lead Agencies.

Gratitude was shown from Bob McNally to Dawn Gouge for the Stop School Pests meeting in Dallas last fall and for leading change agent training for the EPA HQ and Regional school staff.

- Following up on Marc Lame's comment, he mentioned he could not speak about going to the Regional Administrators for funding. There was further discussion from Bob McNally about the FTE's dedication to School IPM and the flexibility of each Region in how they use their resources.
- As an example to follow, Juliann Barta, the Region 10 School IPM Coordinator, said about a one-third of her time is spent on School IPM with additional assistance from Derrick Tereda.

The work of the Regions has been great, according to Dawn Gouge, and she asked if we could recognize Regions for their hard work with School IPM.

- In response, Bob McNally said the regions can be recognized through medals and cash awards.
- Addressing the regional FTE's with greater transparency would create more accurate reporting of investments according to Tom Green.

Planning Documents

The group was asked to share their thoughts on our wholesale approach.

- Marc Lame stated that the wholesale approach does not work if there is no retail outlet. To ensure the existence of retail outlets, retail must be supported through building the change agent corps. He further mentioned that the Health Agencies and Extension Services can serve the retail outlets.
- Dave Tamayo talked about the success story in California where Code Enforcement Officers looking at structural deficiencies in housing which led to IPM legislation. He also said he could provide the contact information for those people in California behind this.
- Robyn Gilden mentioned other nursing groups (American Nurses Association) which could become affiliates.
- Dawn Gouge said some of them have already been contacted.

Center of Expertise for School IPM Activities

Thomas Cook presented the slides on the Center of Expertise activities, and he began by mentioning within Resource Development that the *Rat Book* is being updated. He then discussed the outreach of the Center by including the success of the webinars, additional webinar topics, and blogs which are being distributed. School staff, state officials, industry members, and health professionals are among the participants in the webinars. In the future, schools which have successfully implemented IPM will be featured in the webinars. In the future, the Center will be providing national technical assistance and participating in national conferences, according to Bob McNally.

The status of the EPA School IPM website and its development was brought forth by Dawn Gouge, and Frank Ellis informed the group that the site has been operational for about two weeks. Since the site is so new, all of the information has not been fully updated. The EPA listserv will also be announced soon externally, and will provide everyone with up to date information on School IPM.

- The use of current School IPM coordinators to train and develop other IPM coordinators and change agents in other states, was a process suggested by Marc Lame. For example, tapping into strong IPM coordinators like Ricardo Zubiarte (Salt Lake City Schools).
- There is a difference between information and training to yield better behavioral results. Louis Jackai noted that the webinars are important and can get a lot of traction but that he didn't see a significant investment in workshops for hands-on training.
- Marc Lame also mentioned that there is expertise within the Center, but it is not as visible as it should be.

- A core group of School IPM coordinators and experts should be put together as they are our “secret weapons,” suggested Marc Lame.
- Tom Green stated that there was no way to get a list of all EPA blogs on School IPM and that the School IPM website is missing some recent blogs and events.

Frank Ellis closed this section by saying the website is a snapshot currently and it will become more thorough as information is added.

Grants

Frank Ellis mentioned that Claudia Riegel (City of New Orleans) has submitted some information in her grant’s final report but she has been out of the country and hasn’t been able to give specific data. He also mentioned Improving Kids’ Environments (IKE) grant and asked if IPM grew from the pilot schools to the entire districts.

- Bob McNally mentioned some specific metrics and asked for feedback on what specifically worked.
- The grants calls will soon be reconstituted, stated Thomas Cook, to keep grantees aware of each other’s efforts and general School IPM updates.
- Tributaries are coming together and everyone is now aware of what we need to implement the programs, according to Bob McNally.

Washington State School IPM Enhancement Pilot – Juliann Barta and Carrie Foss

Juliann Barta and Carrie Foss gave a presentation on the pilot project in Washington State and the success they have had with School IPM. Focus groups and the structure of the groups was highlighted by Juliann. She stated that there was great interest in peer to peer mentoring instead of government talking heads for IPM. IPM Star has been a great catalyst for schools. Intense documentation is taking place within the state and a report will be made of the lessons learned, successes, and progress. At the end of the project, there are plans for an informational webinar to document the pilot project. Focus groups need the support of the EPA and extension services to implement IPM.

The project is intended to last 18 months and they are currently one year into the project, according to Carrie Foss. The project comprises around fifteen percent of her work time. One of the priorities is strengthening the partnerships and programs. Carrie Foss has been doing IPM with the WSU Extension for 18 years and the work is an ongoing effort with diffusion, building coalitions, and promoting IPM Star. She proceeded by providing information about UPEST (Urban Pesticide Education Strategy Team), which began in 1994.

A letter of support with high level support and signatures was sent to all schools in the state to recommend IPM, according to Juliann. In the pilot project, the letter of support was signed by the Region 10 Administrator and the Washington Secretary of Health and Education. A letter with such highly regarded support goes a long way to promote School IPM.

- Bob McNally noted that such a letter could be a good model for national efforts.

Following the discussion of the letter of support, Carrie Foss talked about the success of the two coalition events. She is unsure for sure how many students were impacted by change with SIPM, but participation in the coalition events by school districts represented around 170,000 students within the

state. Follow up sheets were provided to participants and based on their feedback, Juliann Barta said the attendees were very happy with the training provided at the coalition events.

The pilot's recognition program will focus primarily on the Great Start level, according to Juliann, and will incorporate the school districts who have already been awarded IPM Star certification. She has compiled a detailed spreadsheet that contains 75 districts and the practices being implemented within each school district. Schools are skeptical when she does a walk-through, because they initially think she is there to inspect for compliance issues.

Within the Team slide, Carrie Foss discussed the importance of partnerships and how valuable funding from the EPA and USDA is to the projects. There are people who are very committed to the project and their strategic approach is critical to success. An event will be scheduled in September for the districts attaining certain levels of IPM and a webinar will occur later in the fall to present the successes and lessons learned during the project. The next steps of the project will be to continue to build networks, according to Juliann. She is continuing to assess the follow-up forms and is looking to other regions for ideas to connect with.

The floor was then opened for comments from the group regarding the Washington Project. Bob McNally commended Juliann Barta and Carrie Foss on their work with the project and mentioned that the letters to schools is a great tool. Marc Lame said more of this type of work should be carried out in other states. He believes partnerships are the way to move forward. Dave Tamayo suggested that the EPA Regional Administrators need to see the success of the pilot, and it should be used to leverage the program.

Community IPM Update – Dawn Gouge

Dawn Gouge gave a summarized update of Community IPM. She showed the key contacts within each state, and discussed how bed bugs are a key concern and a top priority in 12/13 environments. Because bed bugs are such a huge concern, they create a path for talking about School IPM. During the brief presentation, Dawn also touched on the difference between training and education, and how there should be a more hands on approach to make the training more successful.

Adjourn

Appendix A. IPM Workgroup Meeting Participants

EPA

Office of Pesticide Programs / Biopesticides & Pollution Prevention Division

Marcia Anderson
Shanda Bennett
Thomas Cook
Frank Ellis
Lee (Roy) Fillaw
Sherry Glick
Bob McNally
Brad Miller
Lee Tanner

Office of Air and Radiation / Indoor Environments Division

Jennifer Lemon

Members

Andrew Bray, National Pest Management Association
Geoffrey Calvert, US Public Health Service
Tom Delaney, National Association of Landscape Professionals
Carrie Foss, Washington State Univ.
Dawn Gouge, Univ. of Arizona
Tom Green, IPM Institute
Robyn Guilden, Univ. of Maryland School of Nursing
Janet Hurley, Texas AgriLife Extension
Louis Jackai, NC Agricultural & Technical State Univ.
Marc Lame, Indiana Univ.
Dave Tamayo, Sacramento Co. (CA)